

Comments on LPFM Proposal

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

In the Matter of:

RECEIVED

1) Commercial vs non-commercial

MAR 26 1999

2) Method of license issue

FEE MAIL ROOM

3) Amnestty

~~MM~~ Docket #
MM 99-25

4) Pre-existing ownership

5) Ownership limits

6) Multiple formats on same area

7) wattage 8) channel adjacency

9) spectrum increase 10) channel 6

10) Secondary status

Comments of

Robert L. duRivage

No. of Copies rec'd 019
List ABCDE

Box 10101 Detroit, MI, 48210

I, Robert duRivage, file these comments on ~~radio~~ March 10, 1999 in the FCC's ~~MM-99-25~~ MM-99-25 for LPFM radio.

1) I am not as concerned with giving commercial status as I am ^{with} non-commercial and non-profit. I think that licenses should be

should be given first to: 1) non-commercial, then 2) non-profit and, if any space on the broadcast area remains, 3) commercial

a.) Highest bidder method of license issue should not pertain to non-commercial stations as this would exclude most stations who brought about the issue of CPFM legalization in the first place. Licenses should be issued to stations who would broadcast the greatest amount of community programming with the broadest range of such. By community programming, I mean ^{at} music & poetry & theatre by area artists

b.) information about area organizations (religious, artists, union) c.) community calendar

3.) I would demand amnesty for all broadcasters who were not abusing the airwaves with profanity or explicit sexual sensationalism or violent sensationalism, or violent propaganda such as how to manufacture a biological weapon. If it were not for the "private" stations, this debate (MM 99-25) would not even be up for comment.

LPFM Comments

MM 99-25 (p.3)

4.) license should not be issued to any entity with any business affiliation with an existing ~~or~~ highly commercial station.

5.) Ownership should be limited to one per broadcast area and owner should reside in or near station area.

6.) There should be no two stations with similar programming in the same broadcast area eg: two Christian or Hispanic stations in same listening area.

7.) Wattage should be no more than 400 watts for this proposal as it would reduce the possibility for diversity of programming because more than one lower watt station can exist where perhaps only one higher watt station can. Also this would deter any corporate interest.

8.) If first adjacent channeling is possible

Support it.

9.) Any possibility for spectrum increase (Digital) should be included in the proposal.

10.) Finally, Television channel 6 should be used as well (fill below 88)

Above all, some regulation for LPFM ~~should be~~

~~LPFM~~
LPFM

MM 99-25 p 4

for LPFM radio should exist. There is
an obvious demand for it and, with more and more
corporate consolidation & homogenization,
a real need to protect the community
interest. I thank you.

Submitted by: _____

Robert L du Rivage

Robert L du Rivage

Box 10101, Detroit, MI, 48210